

**AGENDA**  
**State and Local Advisory Team (SLAT)**  
*Thursday, December 5, 2019*  
*Richmond Room*  
*1604 Santa Rosa Road*  
*Richmond, VA 23229*  
*9:30- 12:00pm*

	Person Responsible	Time Allocated	Outcome	Follow up?
<b>Introductions and Opening Remarks</b>	Karen Reilly-Jones	10 minutes		
<b>Approval of Minutes</b>	Karen Reilly-Jones	5 minutes		
<b>Public Comment</b>		5 minutes		
<b>Protected Funds/Non-Mandate Report</b>	Karen Reilly-Jones	30 minutes		
<b>SEC Strategic Planning Update</b>		15 minutes		
<b>Member Updates:</b> <b>State:</b> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. DOH</li> <li>2. DJJ</li> <li>3. DSS</li> <li>4. DBHDS</li> <li>5. DMAS</li> <li>6. DOE</li> </ol> <b>Local:</b> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. DSS</li> <li>2. CSA</li> <li>3. CSB</li> <li>4. CSU</li> <li>5. Judge</li> <li>6. Parent</li> <li>7. Provider</li> <li>8. Schools</li> </ol>	Jeannine Uzel Beth Stinnett Em Parente Nina Marino Laura Reed Sabrina Gross  Rebecca Vinroot Karen Reilly-Jones Ivy Sager Martha Carroll Hon. Ashley Tunner  Shannon Updike Angela Neely	60 minutes		
<b>OCS Report</b>	Zandra Relaford	15 minutes		
<b>Adjourn</b>				

**2020 Meeting Schedule: February 6, April 2, June 4, August 6, October 1, December 3**



**MINUTES – October 3, 2019**  
**STATE & LOCAL ADVISORY TEAM (SLAT)**  
**CHILDREN’S SERVICES ACT**  
**Richmond Room**  
**1604 Santa Rosa Road**  
**Richmond, VA 23229**

**Members Present:** Karen Reilly-Jones, SLAT Chair, CSA Coordinators Network; Shannon Updike, SLAT Vice-Chair, VCOPPA; Pam Fisher, DBHDS; Ivy Sager, CPMT – CSB Representative; Rebecca Vinroot, CPMT – LDSS Representative; Martha Carroll, CPMT – CSU Representative, Sabrina Gross, DOE; Em Parente, DSS; Pat Smith, DMAS; The Honorable Ashley Tunner, Juvenile and Domestic Relations District Court Representative; Susan Aylor, CPMT – School Representative; Beth Stinnett, DJJ

**Members Absent:** Jeannine Uzel, VDH

**OCS Staff Members and Guests Present:** Scott Reiner, Kristi Schabo, Marsha Mucha (guest list attached)

**Introductions and Chair Remarks**

Karen Reilly-Jones, SLAT Chair, called the meeting to order at 9:30 a.m. She welcomed members and guests. Introductions were made.

**Approval of Minutes**

The August 1, 2019 meeting minutes were approved on a motion by Susan Aylor, seconded by Shannon Updike and carried.

**Public Comment**

There was no public comment.

**Review/Feedback from the SEC/SLAT Strategic Planning Session**

Mrs. Reilly-Jones asked members for their feedback on the recent strategic planning session held jointly with the State Executive Council (SEC). She reminded members of SLAT’s role as an advisory body to the SEC.

Members briefly discussed the timeline of major transformational activities undertaken by agencies with representation on both the SEC and SLAT. Mrs. Reilly-Jones noted that she would like to see a timeline of the major initiatives, how they overlap and the impacts of those initiatives on other agencies and stakeholders. Members also noted the importance of sharing information and being cognizant of making sure staff and other stakeholders have the latest/up-to-date information.

**Member Updates**

Members reported on activities and the statuses of ongoing projects, new programs, grant opportunities, and upcoming conferences/events. Members also continue to work within their agencies and advocate through their associations for improvements to services and service delivery for the children, youth and families of Virginia.

In conjunction with the Virginia Department of Social Services (VDSS) report, members discussed ongoing census concerns of the Commonwealth Center. They also discussed the number of out-of-state

Draft

placements due to lack of services and the capacity in Virginia to serve the most difficult youth. Mrs. Reilly-Jones noted that the previous workgroup that convened in response to census concerns at the Commonwealth Center should reconvene. Ms. Fisher (DBHDS) and Ms. Smith (DMAS) will share this concern with their respective agencies. Members requested a follow up report be presented at the next SLAT meeting in December.

Upcoming events include:

- The Virginia Coalition of Private Provider Associations (VCOPPA) will host its fall symposium on November 6-7, 2019.
- The Virginia Family Network will sponsor an Advanced Parent Leadership Training in Woodbridge, October 19-20, 2019.
- The National Alliance on Mental Illness (NAMI) Virginia will hold its state conference on October 26-27, 2019.

### **OCS Report**

Zandra Relaford and Scott Reiner reported:

- *FY2019 Reporting* - The last day to submit FY2019 CSA pool reimbursement requests was September 30, 2019. Overall expenditures rose 6.2% over FY2018. Foster care expenditures increased significantly over the previous year.
- *Regional Training Events* - A series of regional trainings are being planned in coordination with other child-serving agencies for the spring of 2020. The trainings will focus on local implementation of evidence-based practices.

### **Non-Mandated Survey Results and Next Steps**

Mrs. Reilly-Jones provided background information on the request from the SEC to review the use of non-mandated funds, including barriers to use of the funds and best practices. At the August SLAT meeting, a SLAT workgroup was formed to summarize information previously collected by SLAT through a survey on the use of these funds and to draft recommendations for presentation to the SEC.

During a review of the recommendations, SLAT members suggested a few edits to the document to provide clarification. The revised document will be sent to the members of the workgroup for final review before presentation at the December SLAT meeting.

### **Adjournment and Next Meeting**

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 12:00 p.m. The next meeting will be held on December 5, 2019 in the Richmond Room, 1604 Santa Rosa Rd., in Richmond.

## SLAT workgroup for "Non-Mandated" Study

### October SLAT Report

#### Background:

In 1994, with revisions in 1995, 1996, and 1997) the State Executive Council for Children's Services (SEC) established a policy ("Protected Funds") which allow localities to "protect" a specific amount of their CSA state pool funds allocation for populations not considered sum-sufficient under the CSA statute (Code of Virginia, §2.2-5211 (C)). These were typically referred to as "non-mandated" children and youth. The purpose of this policy was to ensure that children not meeting the sum-sufficient eligibility criteria would be able to access resources through the CSA.

The SEC established the levels of protected funding and notified localities of those amounts each year. In FY 2019, the amount in the protected category ranged from \$10,000 to \$1,630,458. The total protected state CSA pool funds is \$14.5 million, and this amount has remained unchanged since 1997. The use of the protected funds by a locality is optional and protected funds not used for the "non-mandated" population may be utilized to funds required services for the sum-sufficient children and youth. Protected funds require local matching funds as do all other CSA expenditures.

On September 20, 2018, the SEC requested that the State and Local Advisory Team (SLAT) study the use of "non-mandated" CSA funds. The concern expressed was that there may be barriers to accessing funding and that localities are not fully maximizing the funding opportunity.

At the December 13, 2018 SEC meeting, Karen Reilly-Jones, SLAT Chair, presented a summary of the utilization of "non-mandated funds" in fiscal years 2017 and 2018.

*FY 2017, \$5,084,329 spent on non-mandated services, 35% of the "protected" amount.*

*FY 2018, \$4,624,160 spent on non-mandated services, 32% of the "protected" amount.*

- *More localities utilized non-mandated funds, up 3% from FY2017*
- *Top ten localities use the majority (67%) of non-mandated funds.*
- *Localities with high utilization rates (based on allocation) range in expenditures as low as \$9,782 to \$336,112. These localities also:*
  - *Vary in range in size and population, from Buena Vista (pop. 6,650) to Hampton (pop. 137,467)*
  - *Vary in geographical regions, spanning from the far West in Wise County to the Eastern Shore in Accomack County.*
- *The Tidewater region seems to have a high utilization of localities maximizing non-mandated funds.*
- *11.6 % decrease in unused funds from FY17 to FY18*
- *6.5% decrease in number non-participating localities*
- *Unused local allocations range from \$2,523 to \$1,073,425 (Local Average \$54,653)*

Between December 2018 and April 2019, SLAT developed a survey to address the concerns. On April 4, 2019, SLAT approved the survey and disseminated it to local stakeholders. The survey provided an educational opportunity as well as best practice guidance.

(From Survey)

### **Protected Funds (Non-Mandated)**

*Each year localities may utilize a specific amount of their total state base pool allocation, to provide services to children and families not in the mandated (sum sufficient) CSA population but who otherwise meet CSA eligibility criteria. This amount is typically referred to as non-mandated or "protected" funds.*

*The amount that each locality is permitted to protect is determined by a statewide formula. Each locality is informed of their level of protected funds prior to the beginning of each fiscal year. If the "protected" amount is not spent on non-mandated children, it may be used to address the funding needs of the mandated population.*

*These funds provide local CPMTs with flexibility in serving children and families who need interventions, services, and supports, but who do not meet the "mandated" CSA eligibility criteria. These children and youth are typically referred by the local court service unit, the community services board, local schools (not for private day placement), or by direct referral from families.*

### **Did you know?**

- *When meeting CSA program eligibility; services purchased with non-mandated funds can be used for an array of services such as intensive care coordination, parent coaching, therapeutic camp, residential treatment, assessments, etc.?*
- *That many referral sources can (and do) access non-mandated services like Court Services, Schools, and Community Services Board, Social Services, Interagency teams, and families?*
- *That 48% of localities (62) currently do not use their allocated non-mandated funds (average \$54,653 per locality)?*

## **SURVEY**

There were over 100 responses from 65 localities (representing approximately 96% of localities using these funds). Respondents ranged from CSA Coordinators, to CPMT agency representatives, and local government administrators.

The survey provided helpful information from localities that actively use non-mandated funds:

*55% Disagreed/strongly disagreed that barriers exist for full implementation for the use of non-mandated funds.*

*27% Agreed/strongly agreed that barriers do exist*

Community based services represented the majority of services purchased with non-mandated funds; Mentoring, Parent coaching, assessment and evaluations being the top three.

*89% of responding localities reported that the use of these funds positively supported the local mission of CSA.*

*76% reported that local resources are available to support the use of these funds.*

*75% agreed that the use of these funds are fully integrated into local practice*

*63% disagreed that there are local restrictions on funding services*

There were 68 responses from 42 localities not using non-mandated funding (representing approximately 65% of localities not using these funds). Similarly, respondents ranged from CSA Coordinators, to CPMT agency representatives, and local government administrators.

The top four reasons reported for not using non-mandated funds are:

- FAPT determines other ways to serve with CSA funds (CHINS, SPED Wrap, Parent placements, etc.)
- Local match rate
- Not enough allocated to make it worth it
- Other themes: Uncertainty on process/eligibility, local preference, local funding...

Other survey takeaways:

- 53% agreed that there are gaps in local services that non-mandated funds could support
- 46% agreed that their locality had no interest in using non-mandated funding
- 44% disagreed that there are adequate resources available in their community

If these localities were to use these funds, *community-based services* were identified as most beneficial. The top three named:

- 1) Parent coaching/support
- 2) Out of school time programs (i.e. camp, after school programs, etc.)
- 3) Mentoring/Intensive Care Coordination (tied)

Directed by SLAT at the August 1, 2019 meeting, a SLAT workgroup, consisting of members and community stakeholders, met to summarize information and draft recommendations to the SLAT. Members reviewed the survey results and concluded:

***Over all it seems that localities access local resources and funding opportunities to serve children and families. However, there are identified barriers that exist that may impact localities to fully access the CSA non-mandated/protected funds.***

The workgroup recommended:

Easy/short term:

- 1) Develop specific training and informational materials (i.e. e-learning, on line resources, FAQ document, etc.) to CSA coordinators, CPMT members, and CSA stakeholders. (Lead: OCS and SLAT)
- 2) Re-brand the language, change from "non-mandated" to "protected" funds and use consistent language in the CSA User Guide and Manual. (Lead: OCS)
- 3) Collect local stories and best practices examples of 1) maximizing community collaborative funds and resources (i.e. Promoting Safe and Stable Families/PSSF, Virginia Juvenile Community Crime Control Act/VJCCCA; etc.) and 2) successful use of protected funding for publishing on website and/or training. (Lead: CSA Coordinators)

More complicated/longer term goals for SEC to consider:

The following recommendations will require changes to either SEC Policy, legislation, and or budget allocations and/or appropriations language.

- 1) Explore eliminating limited allocation of protected funds and allow localities flexibility to request additional funds similar to the SPED Wrap allocation model or grant like process.
- 2) Merge SPED wrap funds and protected funds to allow localities to determine how to best use funds.
- 3) Explore using protected/SPED Wrap funds to support non IEP services in the schools.
- 4) Explore restrictions on use of protected funds that prohibit requesting additional (supplemental) funding for these expenditures.

Workgroup met on September 13, 2019, members were: Angel Young-Gill, CSA Dinwiddie; Ivy Sager, Hanover CSB and SLAT member; Julie Dubee, CSA Hanover; Mills Jones, CSA Goochland; Rebecca Vinroot, James City DSS and SLAT member; and Karen Reilly-Jones, CSA Chesterfield/Colonial Heights and SLAT Chair